

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
 MARK A. PERRY (*pro hac vice*)  
 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
 Washington, DC 11101  
 Telephone: 202.955.8500  
 mperry@gibsondunn.com

RIMINI STREET, INC.  
 DANIEL B. WINSLOW (*pro hac vice*)  
 6601 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 300  
 Pleasanton, CA 94566  
 Telephone: (925) 264-7736  
 dwinslow@riministreet.com

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
 JEFFREY T. THOMAS (*pro hac vice*)  
 BLAINE H. EVANSON (*pro hac vice*)  
 JOSEPH A. GORMAN (*pro hac vice*)  
 CASEY J. MCCracken (*pro hac vice*)  
 3161 Michelson Drive  
 Irvine, CA 92612-4412  
 Telephone: 949.451.3800  
 jtthomas@gibsondunn.com  
 bevanson@gibsondunn.com  
 jgorman@gibsondunn.com  
 cmccracken@gibsondunn.com

RIMINI STREET, INC.  
 JOHN P. REILLY (*pro hac vice*)  
 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 500  
 Las Vegas, NV 89169  
 Telephone: (336) 908-6961  
 jreilly@riministreet.com

HOWARD & HOWARD ATTORNEYS PLLC  
 W. WEST ALLEN (Nevada Bar No. 5566)  
 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 1000  
 Las Vegas, NV 89169  
 Telephone: (702) 667-4843  
 wwa@h2law.com

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
 SAMUEL LIVERSIDGE (*pro hac vice*)  
 ERIC D. VANDEVELDE (*pro hac vice*)  
 333 South Grand Avenue  
 Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197  
 Telephone: 213.229.7000  
 sliversidge@gibsondunn.com  
 evandeveld@ibsondunn.com

*Attorneys for Defendant  
 Rimini Street, Inc.*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ORACLE USA, INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

RIMINI STREET, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:10-cv-00106-LRH-VCF

**RIMINI STREET, INC.'S  
 MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF  
 ORACLE'S MOTION TO SEAL  
 PORTIONS OF ORACLE'S REPLY  
 IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION FOR  
 SANCTIONS AND SUPPORTING  
 DOCUMENTS [ECF NO. 1378]**

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

Defendant Rimini Street, Inc. (“Rimini”) submits this Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of Oracle’s Motion to Seal Portions of Oracle’s Reply in Support of Its Motion for Sanctions Pursuant to Rule 37 and Supporting Documents. *See* ECF No. 1378. Oracle sought to seal portions of Oracle’s Reply and Exhibit A to the Supplemental Declaration of Sean P. Rodriguez (“Rodriguez Declaration”). Rimini agrees that those documents should be sealed and submits this Memorandum in support thereof.

Those documents include information Rimini has designated “Highly Confidential Information – Attorneys’ Eyes Only” pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order governing confidentiality of documents entered by the Court on May 21, 2010, ECF No. 55 (“Protective Order”), and Rules 5.2 and 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Good cause exists to seal the documents because they contain highly confidential information about Rimini’s proprietary processes. This Court has regularly granted motions to file under seal similar information, both in *Rimini I* and *Rimini II*. *See, e.g.*, ECF Nos. 226, 325, 518, 904, 990, 1107, 1228, 1250, 1261; *see also Rimini II*, No. 14-CV-1699-LRH-DJA (D. Nev.), ECF Nos. 127, 137, 222, 280–282, 287, 333–334, 371, 391, 434–436, 602, 625–628, 760–768, 836–849, 1122, 1191.

**I. ARGUMENT**

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) provides broad discretion for a trial court to permit sealing of court documents for, *inter alia*, the protection of “a trade secret or other confidential research, development, or commercial information.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c). Rimini has designated as confidential certain documents and information filed in support of Oracle’s Reply because they contain confidential information about Rimini’s proprietary processes. Specifically, Rimini moves to seal proprietary information regarding the ways in which Rimini provides services to its clients and runs its business operations. This information is reflected in portions of Oracle’s Reply and in Exhibit A to the Rodriguez Declaration.

Exhibit A contains testimony regarding the specific operation of one of Rimini’s proprietary tools and how Rimini provides services to its clients. Exhibit A was designated

highly confidential by Rimini. Portions of Exhibit A are reflected in Oracle's Reply. In addition, Oracle's Reply contains other commercially sensitive information regarding the operation of Rimini's proprietary tools and business processes and quotes or paraphrases information from exhibits that are subject to Rimini's Motion to Seal (ECF No. 1373). Rimini likewise designated this information highly confidential under the Protective Order, and disclosure of this information would cause competitive harm to Rimini.

Under the Protective Order, "all non-public information" regarding "business plans" or "proprietary technical information and specifications" are properly designated confidential, and "extremely sensitive . . . non-public information" including trade secrets are properly designated as highly confidential. Disclosure of this information, whether in Exhibit A itself or in Oracle's Reply, would advantage Rimini's competitors, disclosing trade secrets that would allow Rimini's competitors to adopt methods that have made Rimini successful, and more easily allow them to compete in the third-party software service marketplace. *See Hologram USA, Inc. v. Pulse Evolution Corp.*, No. 14-CV-772, 2015 WL 105793, at \*2 (D. Nev. Jan. 7, 2015) (granting motion to seal where documents "contain[ed] information that could injure Plaintiffs' competitive posture in the . . . industry"); *Spectrum Pharm. Inc. v. Sandoz Inc.*, No. 12-CV-111, 2014 WL 4202540, at \*2 (D. Nev. Aug. 21, 2014) (granting motion to seal where documents contained "proprietary, business practice, trade secret, and technical information that could injure the parties' competitive posture"); *Clark v. Metro. Life Ins. Co.*, No. 08-CV-158, 2010 WL 1006823, at \*1 (D. Nev. Mar. 16, 2010) (granting motion to seal materials that would "bring attention to MetLife's confidential internal business deliberations, organization, and capabilities").

This Court has previously granted motions to file under seal portions of documents containing this type of confidential information regarding Rimini's internal business processes. *See, e.g.*, ECF Nos. 226, 325, 518, 904, 990, 1107, 1228, 1250, 1261, 1307; *see also Rimini II*, No. 14-CV-1699-LRH-DJA, ECF Nos. 627, 1240. Sealing references to Rimini's proprietary information will not frustrate the public's visibility into the judicial process because Rimini

1 requests the targeted sealing of particularly sensitive information and leaves all other documents  
2 unsealed.

3 **II. CONCLUSION**

4 For the foregoing reasons, Rimini respectfully requests that the Court grant leave to file  
5 under seal Oracle's Reply and Exhibit A to the Rodriguez Declaration.

6 Dated: August 14, 2020

7 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

8  
9 By: /s/ Eric D. Vandavelde  
10 Eric D. Vandavelde

11 *Attorneys for Defendant*  
12 *Rimini Street, Inc.*  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28